



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS
2000 NAVY PENTAGON
WASHINGTON DC 20350-2000

OPNAVINST 5420.118
N9I
3 Dec 2019

OPNAV INSTRUCTION 5420.118

From: Chief of Naval Operations

Subj: REQUIREMENTS EVALUATION TEAM PROCESS

Ref: (a) Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System (JCIDS) Manual of
31 August 2018
(b) CJCSI 5123.01H
(c) SECNAVINST 5000.2F
(d) OPNAVINST 5420.117

Encl: (1) Requirements Evaluation Team Roles and Responsibilities
(2) Requirements Evaluation Team Assessment Process

1. Purpose. To establish objectives, roles, responsibilities, and process to implement a requirements evaluation team to expedite the capability-based assessment (CBA) and analysis of alternatives processes as allowed per reference (a) to aid in developing an initial capabilities document (ICD), refining top-level requirements, or developing a capability development document.

2. Applicability. This instruction applies to U.S. Navy organizations that generate, develop, and support requirements as part of the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System (JCIDS) process. Requirements evaluation team roles and responsibilities are detailed in enclosure (1).

3. Background. Per references (a) and (b), the requirements sponsor must derive and refine capability requirements and associated gaps for which a solution must be provided either organically or leveraged by other means. The establishment of a requirements evaluation team can facilitate a focused and rapid approach to execute this process. The requirements evaluation team process, detailed in enclosure (2), allows requirements sponsors and supporting organizations to quickly transition from gap analysis to the pursuit of materiel and non-materiel solutions to address identified capability gaps.

4. Objectives. Provide a streamlined path to identify materiel and non-materiel solutions to previously validated capability requirements using existing analyses and documentation (i.e. existing concepts of operations, CBAs, studies, ICDs, etc.). The optimal objective of a requirements evaluation team is to assess and analyze all information required to proceed to the appropriate Naval Capabilities Board, Resources and Requirements Review Board, or gate 1 review, per references (c) and (d).


5. Action. The requirements evaluation team assessment process is provided in enclosure (2). Joint and Service staff procedures for review and approval of JCIDS documents, as well as business rules to support these processes, are detailed in references (b) and (c).

6. Records Management

a. Records created as a result of this instruction, regardless of format or media, must be maintained and dispositioned per the records disposition schedules located on the Department of the Navy/Assistant for Administration, Directives and Records Management Division portal page at <https://portal.secnav.navy.mil/orgs/DUSNM/DONAA/DRM/Records-and-Information-Management/Approved%20Record%20Schedules/Forms/AllItems.aspx>.

b. For questions concerning the management of records related to this instruction or the records disposition schedules, please contact the local records manager or the Department of the Navy/Assistant for Administration, Directives and Records Management Division program office.

7. Review and Effective Date. Per OPNAVINST 5215.17A, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Warfighting Requirements and Capabilities (CNO N9) will review this instruction annually around the anniversary of its issuance date to ensure applicability, currency, and consistency with Federal, Department of Defense, Secretary of the Navy, and Navy policy and statutory authority using OPNAV 5215/40 Review of Instruction. This instruction will be in effect for 10 years, unless revised or cancelled in the interim, and will be reissued by the 10-year anniversary date if it is still required, unless it meets one of the exceptions in OPNAVINST 5215.17A, paragraph 9. Otherwise, if the instruction is no longer required, it will be processed for cancellation as soon as the need for cancellation is known following the guidance in OPNAV Manual 5215.1 of May 2016.


R. P. BURKE
Vice Chief of Naval Operations

Releasability and distribution:

This instruction is cleared for public release and is available electronically only via the Department of the Navy Issuances Web site, <https://www.secnav.navy.mil/doni/default.aspx>.

REQUIREMENTS EVALUATION TEAM ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

1. CNO N9

- a. Determine whether a proposed study should be pursued via a requirements evaluation team, CBA, or analysis of alternatives based on the availability of existing studies, requirements documents, etc.
- b. Assign requirements sponsor to lead the requirements evaluation team.
- c. Review and approve requirements evaluation team proposal, to include the plan of execution to ensure consistency with existing policy and evolving Navy strategies.
- d. Convene and chair a resources and requirements review board unless otherwise recommended by CNO N9 to have Chief of Naval Operations (CNO) or Vice Chief of Naval Operations (VCNO) chair the board. In the event that CNO or VCNO chairs the board, all reporting as mentioned in this instruction will be made to either of them for that effort.

2. Director, Integrated Warfare (OPNAV N9I)

- a. Chair a naval capabilities board per reference (d) for acquisition category II programs and below.
- b. Guide requirements evaluation team through the requirements process, to include timing and format for in-process reviews and for final requirements evaluation team assessment deliverables.
- c. Attend in-process reviews to identify areas of integration and interoperability to afford other requirements sponsors an opportunity to capitalize on current requirements evaluation team assessment efforts.
- d. Make recommendations to CNO N9, as to disposition of the requirements evaluation team.

3. Requirements Evaluation Team Lead

- a. Develop proposal and plan of execution for presentation to CNO N9.
- b. Identify applicable stakeholders for inclusion in the requirements evaluation team and facilitate communication amongst all members.
- c. Contribute subject matter expertise in developing results and assist in advocating for capability requirements.

d. Coordinate with financial management communities to identify sources of funding for requirements evaluation team efforts.

e. Implement and track actions assigned by CNO N9 to include entry into the JCIDS; Planning, Programming, Budgeting and Execution System; and Defense Acquisition System as appropriate.

4. Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Warfighting Development (CNO N7)

a. As the Navy's senior warfighting development organization, provide representation as required to align requirements evaluation team efforts with warfare and warfighting development.

b. In coordination with Director, Assessment Division (OPNAV N81), provide the requirements evaluation team insight into key operational problems and effects driven by detailed threat assessments provided by Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Information Warfare (CNO N2N6) that will enable strategic end-state success through the lens of the Navy's core naval functions of power projection and sea control.

c. Ensure Navy's analytic efforts, including war games, experiments, testing, and exercises are available to inform the requirements evaluation team process.

d. In articulation of the strategy, help frame required timelines for receipt of needed capability to achieve desired warfighting advantage.

e. At each stage in process review, provide an assessment on the linkage of requirements evaluation team outcomes to achieving strategic goals.

5. CNO N2N6. As the Navy's senior information warfare organization, participate in requirements evaluation team efforts as required to ensure that the team has the most relevant threat and intelligence assessments available in order to identify and prioritize warfighting gaps.

6. Deputy Director, Assessment Division (OPNAV N81B)

a. As the Navy's senior analyst, participate as a requirements evaluation team member as needed.

b. Provide the requirements evaluation team warfighting analyses.

c. At each in-process review and as part of the requirements evaluation team results, provide an assessment on the sufficiency of the analysis used as the foundation of the requirements evaluation team's findings.

REQUIREMENTS EVALUATION TEAM ASSESSMENT PROCESS

1. General. The requirements evaluation team assessment presents an alternative method for previously identified capability gaps to be mitigated or closed and newly identified gaps to be closed or mitigated by proposed materiel or non-materiel solutions in an expedited manner. This concept is supported by existing analysis, CBAs, ICDs, studies, etc.

2. Timeline. The requirements evaluation team assessment will ideally encompass a period of 90 days, not to exceed 120 days, from the point of charter to final disposition. Thirty-day periodic in-process reviews will occur throughout the assessment.

3. Requirements Evaluation Team Assessment. Consists of four phases: (1) initiation and plan development; (2) execution (including in-process reviews; (3) risk evaluation; and (4) disposition.

a. Initiation and Plan Development

(1) The assessment begins with the recognition of a need to mitigate an existing, validated capability gap or the identification of a new capability gap. The CNO N9 will direct the formation of a requirements evaluation team and assign to a requirements sponsor based on the items listed below in subparagraphs 3a(1)(a) and 3a(1)(b).

(a) The warfighting and programmatic assumptions for these existing analyses or documents are documented and consistent with current warfighting and programmatic assumptions, concept of operations, and plans.

(b) There are sufficient studies, analyses, concepts of operations, CBAs, and ICDs that exist to support accelerated analysis and evaluation of warfare gaps and respective capability requirements to warrant development of a requirements evaluation team assessment in lieu of new CBA or analysis of alternatives. If a requirements evaluation team assessment is in lieu of an analysis of alternatives for an acquisition category 1D program, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, must approve this approach.

(2) The assigned team lead will develop a plan of actions and milestones to include membership; source(s) of funding for the requirements evaluation team; identification of relevant, existing analytic products and documents; a study plan in coordination with OPNAV N81B, an in-process review schedule, and expected deliverables. This plan of actions and milestones will be completed in 30 days or less and submitted to CNO N9 for a decision on proceeding with the requirements evaluation team.

(3) The requirements evaluation team will be kept as small as reasonably possible, but be comprised of comprehensive representation across applicable domains and resource sponsors. In addition to subject matter experts and resource sponsors, the team may include representation

from OPNAV N81; Director, Programming (OPNAV N80); CNO N2N6; Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Operations, Plans, and Strategy (CNO N3N5); CNO N7; fleet staffs (U.S Fleet Forces Command, U.S. Pacific Fleet); Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Research, Development, and Acquisition staff; and applicable systems commands.

(4) The requirements evaluation team products should encompass the content of the deliverables required for a Navy gate 2 review. These include at a minimum: assumptions, cost estimates, preferred alternatives, conclusions and recommendations, and approval of performance parameters and system attributes to aid in the development of a capability development document.

b. Execution and In-Process Reviews

(1) Upon establishment, the requirements evaluation team lead will assign tasks to the appropriate supporting requirements and resource sponsors, when applicable, and other stakeholders for further development and action.

(2) To optimize the time spent performing analyses and limit the scope of the study, the requirements evaluation team is encouraged to evaluate and leverage existing validated capability requirements and analyses.

(3) New capability gaps may result from the analyses or studies; availability and maturation of relevant, advanced technologies; and the evolving threat. The requirements evaluation team will catalog all new gaps discovered, and consider any existing non-materiel or materiel solutions to mitigate or close those gaps. Any recommendations developed as a result of newly discovered gaps will be presented during the in-process review.

(4) The requirements evaluation team should use a set-based design approach when considering various materiel solution proposals as they applicable to the purpose of the requirements evaluation team effort (i.e., analysis of alternatives in development of a capability development document). This approach enables a cost-benefit analysis of iterative improvements and modifications to each proposal until an optimal solution is derived to meet the validated capability requirements.

(5) Every 30 days from establishment of the requirements evaluation team, CNO N9 will receive a live in-process review. The in-process review provides CNO N9 an update on how the requirements evaluation team assessment is conforming to the scope and plan of execution provided at establishment and identifies any newly discovered gaps and recommendations. Outcomes from the review could be any of the following listed in subparagraphs 3b(5)(a) through 3b(5)(d).

(a) Proceed with requirements evaluation team assessment to the next in-process review.

(b) Approve recommendations (encompassed in the final materiel or non-materiel solutions) for closing or mitigating newly discovered gaps.

(c) Agreement to exclude newly discovered gaps from further analysis by the requirements evaluation team and forward to CNO N7 and OPNAV N81 for further analysis.

(d) Dissolution of the requirements evaluation team assessment in favor of a more expansive effort CBA. During the review, it may become apparent that the scope, potential cost, and time spent or projected do not align with the intention of the assessment. For example, if gaps discovered by updated analyses are too numerous, it may be better to dissolve the assessment to pursue a holistic CBA for a more robust identification of gaps and capability requirements.

(6) The final requirements evaluation team assessment must include, but not be limited to:

(a) documentation of requirements evaluation team assessment assumptions and findings,

(b) documentation of cost estimating assumptions and rough order-of-magnitude cost comparison of the material or non-material solutions,

(c) assessment of the operating and support resources required and operating and support implications and challenges of the proposed solution, and

(d) review and approve top-level performance parameters and system attributes for development of the analysis of alternatives.

c. Risk Evaluation

(1) Throughout the requirements evaluation team assessment, risk must be continually evaluated. Risk exists in threat assessments, cost estimation, technology maturation, budget projections, schedule estimation, etc. Additionally, risk exists in the requirements evaluation team breaching the 120-day timeline, for which careful consideration must be given to the incurred cost of such a breach.

(2) As the requirements evaluation team assessment proceeds, the requirements evaluation team lead will assess risks and provide CNO N9 an evaluation of risk during the in-process review in order to make an informed decision on how to proceed.

(3) The risk evaluation associated with recommendations for newly discovered gaps will be presented during the in-process review for approval or disapproval as to whether they should be included in the final assessment.

d. Disposition. The requirements evaluation team requirements sponsor will present assessment findings to CNO N9. This final review will be a resources and requirements review board chaired by CNO N9, unless otherwise recommended for CNO or VCNO to chair, as governed by reference (d).